REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The final office action of July 7, 2006 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 2, 4-14, 16-19, 21-28, 30-33 and 35-44 remain in this application. Claims 3, 15, 20, 29, and 34 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicants note with appreciation the courtesies extended to the undersigned by Examiners Rutledge and Hutton during the personal interview on August 15, 2006. The following remarks include applicants' report of the substance of interview pursuant to MPEP § 713.04.

Claims 41-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 5,561,446 to Montlick. Claims 1-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montlick in view of Wilcox et al. (hereinafter "Wilcox"), "Dynomite: A Dynamically Organized Ink and Audio Notebook", CHI 97, March 1997, p. 186-193. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claims 41-44

Applicants have amended independent claim 41 to recite, among other features, sending a command from an application program to an operating system, wherein the command requests activation of an electronic ink entry region for changing a property value stored in electronic ink format of a document or file on the application program; and displaying the user interface with the property value in electronic ink format, the electronic ink entry region adapted to receive electronic ink input to change the property value stored in electronic ink format of the document or file. As ostensibly discussed during the interview, Montlick does not teach or suggest at least the feature of the electronic ink entry region being adapted to receive electronic ink input to change the property value stored in electronic ink format. For at least this reason, applicants submit that claim 41 is patentably distinct from Montlick. Independent claim 43 includes this distinguishing feature is patentable over Montlick for at least the same reasons as claim 41. Claim 42, which depends from claim 41, and claim 44, which depends from claim 43, are allowable over Montlick for the same reasons as their respective base claim, and further in view of the additional advantageous features recited therein.

<u>Claims 1, 2, 4-14, 16-19, 21-28, 30-33 and 35-40</u>

As amended, independent claim 1 calls for, among other features, an input system that receives in electronic ink format a property value of a document or file on or accessible by the computer system as part of a file or document save operation.

<u>Montlick</u> relates to a portable pen-based computer coupled by a wireless network to a host computer. The host computer supplies the portable computer with data and with forms such that handwritten data can be entered in the forms via a stylus and stored in the host computer. The handwritten data is saved as an electronic ink file associated with a particular form, which is stored separately. When the electronic ink file is recalled, the form to which the file is related is also recalled and the information is displayed in an electronic document with the electronic ink being overlaid on the form.

<u>Montlick</u> does not teach or suggest an input system that receives in electronic ink format *a property value* of a document or file on or accessible by the computer system *as part of a file or document save operation* as recited in claim 1. Rather in <u>Montlick</u> an input system receives an electronic ink file that with a template can be recalled to form a document. Stated differently, the electronic ink input via the portable computer is not a property value associated with the template. Moreover, <u>Montlick</u> lacks a teaching or suggestion of anything analogous to a property value being received as part of a file or document save operation. Necessarily, <u>Montlick</u> does not allow the operating system to access a stored property value in electronic ink format or render a stored property value in electronic ink format.

To overcome the deficiencies of <u>Montlick</u>, the action relies on <u>Wilcox</u>. The properties disclosed in <u>Wilcox</u>, as described at page 189, are "associated with ink and with the entire note page". <u>Wilcox</u> does however, allow *text* keywords to be associated with a page of notes. Notably, as described at page 190 of <u>Wilcox</u>, text keywords can be entered by being "written in a keyword entry box and recognized using handwriting recognition software." In contrast, claim 1 calls for an input system that receives in electronic ink format a property value of a document or file on or accessible by the computer system *as part of a file or document save operation*. <u>Wilcox</u> lacks a teaching or suggestion of saving a keyword as part of a file or document save operation. In addition, <u>Wilcox</u> neither teaches nor suggests storing the property value of the document or file in electronic ink format or rendering the stored property value in electronic ink format. At most,

Wilcox stores a text keyword and displays the stored text keyword in text format as shown in Figure 3 on page 190.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, the combination of Montlick and Wilcox, even if proper, does not result in the claim 1 combination of features. For at least this reason, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the applied art. Also, independent claims 13 and 27 are similar to independent claim 1, in at least some of the distinguishing respects discussed above. For at least this reason, claims 13 and 27 are patentably distinct from the combination Montlick and Wilcox.

Claims 2 and 4-12; 14, 16-19 and 21-27; and 28, 30-33 and 35-40, which respectively depend from claims 1, 13 and 27, are patentably distinct from Montlick in combination with Wilcox for the same reasons set forth above with respect to their ultimate base claim, and further in view of the additional advantageous features recited therein. For example, claim 9 (and similarly claims 22 and 36) recites that the received property value in electronic ink format is assigned as a title of the document or file, which is neither taught nor suggested by the applied art. Also, claim 11 (and similarly claims 24 and 38) further recites that the input system is configured to receive from a user a change to the property value in electronic ink format associated with the document or file. Such a feature is absent from the applied art.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that no fee is required for this submission. If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: August 21, 2006   By: /Gary D. Fedorochko/ _____
                                        Gary D. Fedorochko
                                        Registration No. 35,509

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001
GDF:lab